



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,916	12/10/2003	Mark Pearson	24207-10064	5789
63296 7590 04/28/2009 GOOGLE / FENWICK SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA ST. MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041				
EXAMINER				
BROWN, SHEREE N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2163				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,916

Applicant(s)

PEARSON ET AL.

Examiner

SHEREE N. BROWN

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 97-99, 103-109, 112, 113 and 115-128 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 97-99, 103-109, 112, 113 and 115-128 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/24/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/25/2009 has been entered.

Claim Status

2. Claims 97-99, 103-109, 112-113 and 115-128 are pending and presented for examination. Claims 1-96, 100-102, 110-111 and 114 have been cancelled. Claims 97, 120-121 have been amended.

3. This action has been made NON-FINAL.

Response to Amendment

4. Referring to the claim objections, applicant's amendments have been acknowledged. Accordingly, examiner withdraws the objection.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 06/24/2008 was filed after the mailing date of the application on 12/10/2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 97, 103-105, 107-109, 113, 120-121 and 128 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horn et al. (US Patent No. 7,013,289, Date Filed: February 21, 2001, hereinafter Horn).

Claims 97:

Regarding Claim 97, Horn teaches a computer-implemented method for displaying information, the method comprising:

in response to receiving a search query for a product, searching an index of articles that describe products for sale (*column 42, lines 63-67, Horn*);

determining, based on the index searching, that a first article is responsive to the search query, the first article including price information for the product and one or more images of the product (*column 25, lines 23-31 and lines 40-45 and column 42, lines 63-67, wherein images and prices are displayed with the products, Horn*);

selecting a price for the product from the first article (*column 56, lines 58-61, wherein the buyer chooses to purchase at wholesale prices, Horn*);

selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price (*column 43, lines 39-42, wherein manufacturer's URL for product thumbnail and wherein the hyperlink is clickable within the area of the thumbnail and wherein thumbnail is interpreted to be A small version of a photo or Image browsers commonly display thumbnails of photos several or even dozens at a time, Horn*); and
displaying the price and the image for the product (*column 42, lines 64-67, Horn*).

Claim 103:

Regarding Claim 103, Horn teaches wherein selecting the image for the product comprises determining a price representation (*column 13, lines 46-48, wherein manufacturer's build a worldwide brand name based on authentic products, ethical representation, fair prices, and good prices to buyers and column 20, lines 44-47, wherein the manufacturer's locale currency used to calculate prices in other product record versions, is equivalent to determining a price representation, Horn*).

Claim 104:

Regarding Claim 104, Horn teaches wherein selecting the price for the product comprises determining a font size of the price (*column 21, lines 28-31, respectively, Horn*).

Claim 105:

Regarding Claim 105, Horn teaches wherein selecting the price for the product comprises determining a font face of the price (*column 21, lines 27-33, respectively, Horn*).

Claim 107:

Regarding Claim 106, Horn teaches wherein selecting the price for the product comprises determining a word following the price (*column 36, lines 34-38, wherein the global store calculates total cost including shipping and displays the total cost, wherein this is interpreted to correspond with applicants specification, paragraph [0033], wherein some words immediately preceding a potential price can indicate rebate and shipping, Horn*).

Claim 108:

Regarding Claim 108, Horn teaches wherein selecting the image for the product based on the price comprises determining global information associated with the product (*column 26, lines 15-26, respectively, Horn*).

Claim 109:

Regarding Claim 109, Horn teaches wherein determining global information associated with the product comprises one selected from the group consisting of:
determining a number of documents from a source associated with the first article,
determining a frequency of occurrence of the image for the product on a network, and
determining a size of the image (*column 43, lines 32-41, wherein the images and size is associated with product and column 46, lines 44-50, wherein the invention accommodates a many to many relationship between products and categories; a product among many products to be related to more than one category among many categories and the use of this table when joined with the product table facilitates selection of all products in a category that are requested to be displayed, which is interpreted to be equivalent to determining a number of documents from a*

source associated with the first article and frequency of occurrence of the image for the product, wherein column 42, lines 65-67, all products are displayed with images and descriptions, and so forth, Horn).

Claim 113:

Regarding Claim 113, Horn teaches wherein selecting image for the product base on the price further comprises determining a number of occurrences value associated with the image for the product (*column 42, lines 65-67, wherein a number of products are displayed in the webpage, listing their descriptions, images, and prices, wherein this is interpreted to be equivalent to a number of occurrences associated with the image for the product, wherein an number of products are displayed, Horn*).

Claim 120:

Regarding Claims 120 and 121, Horn teaches a computer program product for displaying information about a product from an article, the method, comprising: a computer-readable medium (*Figure 1, all features, wherein hardware and software are used for buyers and referral websites and column 29, lines 14-21, respectively, Horn*); and computer program code, encoded on the medium (*column 35, lines 46-49, respectively, Horn*), for:

in response to receiving a search query for a product, searching an index of articles that describe products for sale (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*);

determining, based on the index searching, that a first article is responsive to the search query, the first article including a price information for the product and one or

more images of the product (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*);

selecting a price for the product from the first article (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*);

selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*);

and displaying the price and the image for the product (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*).

Claim 121 :

Regarding Claim 121, Horn teaches a computer-implemented system for displaying information about a product from an shopping article, the method, comprising:

means for searching an index of articles that describe products for sale in response to receiving a search query for a product (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*); and

means for determining, based on the index searching, that a first article is responsive to the search query, the first article including price information for the product and one or more images of the product (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*);

means for selecting a price for the product from the first article (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*);

means for selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*); and

means for displaying the price and the image for the product (*See Claim 97, wherein this limitation is rejected under the same rationale, Horn*).

Claim 128:

Regarding Claim 128, Horn teaches determining, based on the index searching, that a second article is responsive to the search query, the second article including price information for the product and one or more images of the product (*see claim 97, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Horn*); selecting a second price for the product from the second article (*see claim 97, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Horn*); selecting a second image for the product from the second article based on the second price (*see claim 97, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Horn*); and displaying the best second price and the best second image for the product from the second document (*see claim 97, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Horn*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 98-99, 106, 115-119, 122-127 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn et al. (US Patent No. 7,013,289, Date Filed: February 21, 2001, hereinafter Horn), Aggarwal et al. (US Patent No. 6,728,706, Date Filed: March 23, 2001, hereinafter Aggarwal) in view of Venkatraman et al. (WO/0113273, Date Filed: February 22, 2001, hereinafter Venkatraman)

Claim 98:

Regarding Claim 98, Horn fails to teach selecting the image for the product based on the price comprises determining a distance between the price for the product and the image for the product. However, Aggarwal teaches wherein selecting the image for the product based on the price comprises determining a distance between the price for the product and the image for the product (*column 8, lines 9-14, wherein different similarity functions can be used for numeric, nominal and images features wherein different similarity functions are used for nominal and non-nominal attributes, wherein these similarity scores are combined to give a similarity score between the two products, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "determining a distance between the price for the product and the image for the product", Aggarwal*).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate an additional feature that involved selecting the image for the product based on the price comprises determining a distance between the price for the

product and the image for the product by Aggrawal within Horn system for the purpose of providing relevant search results to a user that displays a distance between the price for the product and the image for the product.

Claim 99:

Regarding Claim 99, the combination of Horn and Aggarwal teaches selecting the image for the product comprises determining a distance between the price for the product and a term of the search query, and the image for the product and the term of the search query (*column 9, lines 20-33, wherein the system uses the category of the products in which the shopper is interested and extracts the corresponding features from the image of the product if one was submitted by the shopper and once the query point is determined, the goal of the system is to search for points in the feature space that are near this query point, a problem referred to as searching for K-nearest neighbors 340, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "determining a distance between the price for the product and a term of the search query, and the image for the product and the term of the search query", Aggrawal*).

Claim 106:

Regarding Claim 107, the combination of Horn and Aggarwal does not specifically define nor teach wherein selecting the price for the product comprises determining a word preceding the price. On the other hand, Venkatraman teaches wherein selecting the price for the product comprises determining a word preceding the price (*Figure 2B, all features, wherein words such as list price, our price, and you save is preceding the price listed, Venkatraman*).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate an additional feature that involved determining a word preceding the price as disclosed by Venkatraman within Horn & Aggarwal system for the purpose of providing relevant search results to a user that displays the best possible offer or price for that particular product.

Claim 115:

Regarding Claim 115, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein selecting the image for the product based on the price comprises determining a number of words between the price for the product, the image for the product and a term of the search query (*see claim 98, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Aggarwal*).

Claim 116:

Regarding Claim 116, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein the first article has a tree structure (*column 8, lines 36-39, Aggarwal*).

Claim 117:

Regarding Claim 117, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein selecting the image for the product based on the price comprises: determining a closest common ancestor to the price for the product and a term of the search query (*See claim 99, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Aggarwal*); determining the distance from the closest common ancestor to the image (*See claim 99, wherein this limitation is substantially the*

same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Aggarwal); and determining the distance from the closest common ancestor to the term of the search query (See claim 99, wherein this limitation is substantially the same and therefore rejected under the same rationale, Aggarwal).

Claims 118-119:

Claims 118-119, are rejected on the same basis as claim 116.

Claim 122:

Regarding Claim 122, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein selecting the price for the product from the first article comprises determining a best price from among the prices selected from the first article (*column 6, line 37-3, wherein numeric attributes extracted from the product image are used together with other attributes during the similarity search for product and column 9, lines 11-12, wherein determination of attribute values corresponding to the shoppers requirement and wherein attribute value is interpreted to be price, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "wherein the best price is a price most likely to be correctly associated with the product", Aggarwal*), and wherein selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price comprises determining a best image from among the images selected from the first article (*column 7, lines 20-22, wherein the system extracts image features from the product image based on the category to which the product belongs, Aggarwal*).

Claim 123:

Regarding Claim 123, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein determining the best price and the best image for the product comprises:

ranking the prices and the images selected from the first article; selecting a highest ranked price for the product as the best price; and selecting a highest ranked image for the product as the best image (*column 6, line 37-3, wherein numeric attributes extracted from the product image are used together with other attributes during the similarity search for product and column 9, lines 11-12, wherein determination of attribute values corresponding to the shoppers requirement and wherein attribute value is interpreted to be price, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "wherein the best price is a price most likely to be correctly associated with the product", Aggarwal*).

Claim 124:

Regarding Claim 124, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein the ranking ranks based on the distance between each image and each price selected for the product (*column 6, lines 30-37, wherein existing product catalogs in commerce systems store product images along with the textual description and these images are shown to the shopper on request, but the images are not used during product searching but the described embodiment uses the product image together with numeric and nominal product attributes to capture the information available in the visual appearance of the product, Aggarwal*).

Claim 125:

Regarding Claim 125, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein ranking ranks the price based on a price representation score of each price selected for the product (*column 6, lines 1-9 and column 6, lines 33-39, respectively, Aggarwal*).

Claim 126:

Regarding Claim 126, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein the best price is a price most likely to be correctly associated with the product (*column 6, line 37-3, wherein numeric attributes extracted from the product image are used together with other attributes during the similarity search for product and column 9, lines 11-12, wherein determination of attribute values corresponding to the shoppers requirement and wherein attribute value is interpreted to be price, which is interpreted to be equivalent to "wherein the best price is a price most likely to be correctly associated with the product", Aggarwal*).

Claim 127:

Regarding Claim 127, the combination of Horn, Aggarwal and Venkatraman teaches wherein the best image is an image most likely to be correctly associated with the product (*column 7, lines 20-22, wherein the system extracts image features from the product image based on the category to which the product belongs, wherein this is interpreted to correspond to the best image being associated with the product, Aggarwal*).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 02/25/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant Argument #1:

Applicant argues on page 10, "Hence Horn does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed feature of "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price".

Examiner's Response to Argument #1:

Examiner is not persuaded. MPEP § 2106 states Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed Cir. 1997). Examiner maintains Horn teaching of "*manufacturer's URL for product thumbnail and wherein the hyperlink is clickable within the area of the thumbnail and wherein thumbnail is interpreted to be a small version of a photo or Image browsers commonly display thumbnails of photos several or even dozens at a time*" in column 43, lines 39-42, is the same as applicant's teaching of

“selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price”.

Accordingly, examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicant Argument #2:

Applicant argues on page 11, “However, Venkatraman fails to disclose “selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price”.

Examiner’s Response to Argument #2:

Examiner is not persuaded. See Examiner’s Response above.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEREE N. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-4229. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Sheree N. Brown
/Sheree N. Brown/
Examiner, Art Unit 2163
Technology Center 2100
April 20, 2009

*** /don wong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2163